UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/689,005	10/20/2003	Christopher Goode	SEDN/132DIV1	4102

56015 7590 03/04/2009

WALL & TONG, LLP/
SEDNA PATENT SERVICES, LLC
595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE
SUITE 100
SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702

EXAMINER	
THOMAS, JASON M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2423	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/689,005	GOODE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jason Thomas	2423	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 November 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *19-24* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments see pgs. 9-12, filed November 20, 2008, with respect to the rejections of claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new grounds of rejection is made in view of Billock et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,314,575 B1 (hereinafter Billock) and Hamlin et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,477,504 B1 (hereinafter Hamlin).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 7 recites the steps of receiving an applet based interface which is used by a subscriber to interact with service provider equipment by decoding and executing said menu applet, "selecting, through manipulation..." and "sending a selection signal... from said subscriber equipment to said service provider equipment" in response. However it is also recited that the second and third menu applets, which share the similar function of providing an interface to the

subscriber, are sent to the service provider equipment from the subscriber equipment as opposed to originating at the service provider equipment and sent to the subscriber equipment to be decoded and executed as an interface to communicate with the service provider equipment.

As such this claim has been interpreted as: "if the subscriber is said current subscriber, sending a second menu applet from said service provider equipment to said subscriber equipment... if the subscriber is not said current subscriber, sending a third menu applet from said service provider equipment to said subscriber equipment...".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,016,141) in view of Brown (U.S. Patent No. 5,771,435) and Hamlin.

Regarding claim 1: Knudson discloses an interactive information distribution system containing service provider equipment and subscriber equipment that is interconnected by a communications network (see [fig. 1]), a method of providing a subscription-on-demand service for an interactive

information distribution system comprising the steps of: packaging a number of programs into a programming packages; and enabling a subscriber to access any program within a subscribed programming package (see [abstract], [col. 1, ll. 57-63], [col. 3, ll. 2-16], [col. 4, ll. 58-65]).

Knudson is silent on allowing a user to access a program in an on-demand basis and wherein the interface is produced using one or more applets.

Brown however teaches a system that processes request for programming by providing the user with the option of near video on demand or video on demand (see [abstract], [col. 2, ll. 14-23], [col. 2, ll. 55-67], [col. 3, ll. 31-51]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a user with the option of receiving programming in an on-demand basis, as taught in Brown, when providing access to programming through subscription-on-demand services, as taught in Knudson, because providing users with videos in an on-demand basis is in accordance with providing an interactive services to simplify home entertainment by allowing viewers greater flexibility and control over content (see Brown: [col. 1, ll. 23-24]).

Hamlin teaches the use of a dynamically delivered applet for the purpose of generating an interactive user interface to gathering information from a client display unit such as a television set rather than a locally-stored program that generates an interface (see [col. 6, ll. 39-51] for using an applet to gather data from a client device to be later processed).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the GUI used to collect information from viewers, as taught in Knudson, by using dynamically delivered applets, as taught by Hamlin, in order to enable future updates to be made to the function or appearance of the GUI without having to modify the client system.

Regarding claim 2: Knudson, in view of Brown and Hamlin, teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of: enabling a consumer to select a programming package and subscribe to the selected programming package for a predefined price and thereby become said subscriber (see Knudson: [fig. 6, items 92, 98 and 114], [col. 3, ll. 9-16], [col. 6, ll. 55-57]).

Regarding claim 3: Knudson, in view of Brown and Hamlin, teaches the method of claim 1 wherein a subscriber is limited to on-demand access to on-demand programs within the subscribed programming package only during predefined time periods without incurring an additional fee (see Knudson: [col. 6, ll. 22-27], [col. 8, ll. 58-63]).

Regarding claim 4: Knudson, in view of Brown and Hamlin, teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said on-demand programming within said programming package is defined by the subscriber (see Knudson: [col. 5, ll. 13-24], [col. 6, ll. 33-35].

Regarding claim 5: Knudson, in view of Brown and Hamlin, teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the programming packages are arranged in a hierarchical format having subsets of programming packages within a

programming package to enable a viewer to subscribe to a programming package subset without subscribing to an entire programming package (see Knudson: [fig. 7], [fig. 8], [col. 5, ll. 13-24], [col. 6, ll. 4-35], [col. 6, ll. 33-35]).

Regarding claim 6: Knudson, in view of Brown and Hamlin, teaches the method of claim 1 wherein a consumer selects a programming package and subscribes thereto by manipulating a graphical user interface (see Knudson: [fig. 2], [fig. 6], [col. 1, ll. 57-63]).

2. Claims 7-9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson, in view of Billock et al., U.S. 6,314,575 (hereinafter Billock) and Hamlin.

Regarding claim 7: Knudson discloses in an interactive information distribution system containing service provider equipment and subscriber equipment that is interconnected by a communications network, a method of providing a subscription-on-demand service for an interactive information distribution system (see [abstract], [fig. 6], [fig. 9], [col. 1, ll. 55-65], [col. 4, ll. 16-47]). While Knudson teaches providing users with graphical user interfaces (GUI) to receive user selections and respond accordingly by use of a first interface to provide a program guide with selectable programs (see [abstract], [fig. 2]) which are free and can be tuned to and additional menus, which includes at least a second menu allowing the user to subscribe to the subscription programming or packages through impulse purchasing (see [fig. 6, items 88 and 96]), Knudson does not explicitly teach determining if the subscriber is a current subscriber prior

to providing the user with a menu of available subscription programming for purchase or using applets as a means to interact with the user.

Billock teaches a video service that offers video programming on demand (see [cols. 2-3, ll. 50-2]), determines if the viewer is a subscriber and provides the viewer with an interface with which to confirm a new subscription if the viewer is not a current subscriber (see [col. 3 ll. 23-34], [cols. 17-18, ll. 66-32]) however Billock does not teach the use of applets as a means of interacting with the viewer to retrieve viewer selections.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the user interfaces which are presented to the viewer, as taught in Knudson, by including a step which determines if a viewer is a current subscriber and providing the viewer with an interface showing programming for viewing if the viewer is a current subscriber or if a viewer is not a current subscriber providing the viewer with an interface which allows the viewer to interactively become a subscriber, as taught by Billock in order to allow current subscribers the ability to view a selected program substantially at the time the viewer makes a program selection without the delay of having to make a purchase.

Hamlin teaches the use of a dynamically delivered applet for the purpose of generating an interactive user interface to gathering information from a client display unit such as a television set rather than a locally-stored program that

generates an interface (see [col. 6, ll. 39-51] for using an applet to gather data from a client device to be later processed).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the GUI used to collect information from viewers, as taught in Knudson and Billock, by using dynamically delivered applets, as taught by Hamlin, in order to enable future updates to be made to the function or appearance of the GUI without having to modify the client system.

Regarding claim 8: Knudson, in view of Billock and Hamlin, teaches the method of claim 7 wherein second menu applet is connected to other menu applets that provide interactive displays of categories of services, titles of programs available in each category, and program pricing for each tile (see Knudson: [col. 3, ll. 9-16], [col. 4, ll. 32-37], [col. 4, ll. 42-47], [col. 4, ll. 58-65]).

Regarding claim 9: Knudson, in view of Billock and Hamlin, teaches the method of claim 7 further comprising the step of: if a new subscription is created, updating a subscription database within said service provider equipment to identify the subscriber as a subscriber to the selected service (see Knudson: [fig. 6], [col. 3, ll. 22-31], [col. 6, ll. 42-51] for service provider equipment database that is updated as indicated by it updating the user equipment database).

Regarding claim 12: Knudson, in view of Billock and Hamlin, teaches the method of claim 7 wherein the subscriber selects programming for a personal subscription-on-demand service and a personal subscription-on-demand option is included in said display produced from said first menu applet (see Knudson:

[fig. 8] where an option selected is included in a package which can be selected; see also [col. 6, ll. 22-35] for alternative subscription on-demand options).

Regarding claim 13: Knudson, in view of Billock and Hamlin, teaches the method of claim 7 wherein said subscription-on-demand services are arranged in a hierarchical structure (see Knudson: [fig. 7], [fig. 8] for a hierarchal structure including a parent category with a subset of categories within the parent category; see also Knudson: [col. 1, ll. 40-41], [col. 6, ll. 4-35]).

3. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson, in view of Billock, Hamlin and Goode et al., International Pub. No. 98/19459 (hereinafter Goode).

Regarding claims 10 and 11: Knudson, in view of Billock and Hamlin, teaches authorizing a user to subscribe on-demand to programming and programming packages through the use of a graphical user interface (GUI) and performing some action in response (see Knudson: [fig. 2], [fig. 6], [fig. 7], [col. 3, ll. 27-31], [col. 4, ll. 42-47], [col. 4, ll. 58-65]) and using dynamically delivered applets which generate interfaces which are used to receive user input (see Hamlin [col. 6, ll. 39-51] but does not disclose the method of claim 7 further comprising the step of: if a subscriber requests a new subscription, sending a fourth menu applet from said service provider equipment and decoding and executing said fourth menu applet within said subscriber equipment to display a menu that requests a personal identification number (PIN) or master PIN for said subscriber.

Goode teaches an access authorization routine which request a personal identification number (PIN) or master PIN using an interactive graphical method which is executed upon a customer requesting access to information on an information distribution system (see [fig. 3 items 326 & 328], [pp. 2-3, ll. 33-32], [pp. 6-7, ll. 24-6]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to execute an applet capable of using an interactive graphical method to require a user to enter a PIN or master PIN, as taught in Goode, when authorizing a user to subscribe to on-demand programming and programming packages, as taught in Knudson, because it is often necessary to provide system security for interactive information distribution systems (see [pp. 1, ll. 32-33]).

4. Claims 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson, in view of Goode and Hamlin.

Regarding claim 14: Knudson discloses a method of providing a subscription-on-demand service for an interactive information distribution system comprising the steps of: providing a programming selection menu through which a subscriber selects programming for a personal subscription-on-demand service; selecting programming to define said personal subscription-on-demand service; and accessing programming for a predefined price and period (see [fig. 2], [figs. 6-8], [col. 3, ll. 9-16], [col. 4, ll. 58-65], [col. 6, ll. 29-31])

Knudson is silent on storing programming identification codes associated with said selected programming and a subscriber identification number; enabling said subscriber, through use of said subscriber identification number, to access said personal subscription-on-demand service by paying a single predefined price for access to the programming identified by the programming identification codes for a predefined period; and using a menu applet to gather an identification number from the user.

Goode teaches storing programming identification codes associated with said selected programming (such as MPAA ratings) and a subscriber identification number; and accessing said programming through the use of said subscriber identification number (see [figs. 2-5], [pp. 2-3, ll. 33-5], [pp. 3, ll. 6-32], [pp. 3-4, ll. 32-1]) but does not teach doing so using a applet interface.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to associate some form of program identification code with a subscriber identification number such as a PIN where said association determines access, as taught in Goode, when providing subscription on-demand services, as taught in Knudson, because providing a PIN which can be associated with particular programming provides more flexible and useful security measures such as customizable access (see [pp. 2, ll. 9-12]).

Hamlin teaches the use of a dynamically delivered applet for the purpose of generating an interactive user interface to gathering information from a client display unit such as a television set rather than a locally-stored program that

generates an interface (see [col. 6, ll. 39-51] for using an applet to gather data from a client device to be later processed).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the GUI used to collect information from viewers, as taught in Knudson, by using dynamically delivered applets, as taught by Hamlin, in order to enable future updates to be made to the function or appearance of the GUI without having to modify the client system.

Regarding claim 15: Knudson, in view of Goode and Hamlin, teaches does not disclose the method of claim 14 wherein said subscriber identification number is one of a personal identification number, a terminal identification number, or an account number.

Goode teaches where a subscriber can be identified using a PIN, terminal identification number, or an account number (see [fig. 1 items 102 & 104], [pp. 2-3, ll. 33-5], [pp. 6-7, ll. 24-1]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to user other forms of identification such as PIN, terminal identification number or account number, as taught in Goode, when providing subscription on-demand services, as taught in Knudson, because providing a alternate forms of identification provides more flexible and useful security measures (see [pp. 2, ll. 9-12]).

Regarding claim 16: Knudson discloses apparatus for providing subscription-on-demand services within an interactive information distribution

system comprising: service provider equipment containing an information server and a video session manager (see [fig. 1 items 22, 24, 26]; see also [col. 1, ll. 5-18], [col. 1, ll. 26-28], [col. 1, ll. 44-46], [col. 2, ll. 9-18], [col. 3, ll. 37-39] for a program guide system which reads on a video session manager); subscriber equipment containing a subscriber terminal and a display unit, where the service provider equipment is connected to the subscriber equipment by a communications network (see [fig. 1, item 32]); and said video session manager sends a plurality of executable menu applets to said subscriber terminal, said terminal executes each of said menu applets to generate interactive graphical user interface displays through which a subscriber selects a service; if the subscriber is said current subscriber of the selected service, the subscriber can select a subscription program for viewing; if said subscriber is not said current subscriber, the subscriber can become a subscriber to the selected service (see [abstract], [col. 1, ll. 57-63], [col. 3, ll. 2-16], [col. 3, ll. 27-31] [col. 4, ll. 58-65], [col. 8, ll. 58-63]; see [fig. 7] for a menu applet; see also [col. 3, ll. 45-62] transmitting data between the distribution facility and user equipment; [col. 3-4, ll. 63-3] for decoding by demodulation, the transmissions; [col. 4, ll. 42-47], [col. 4, ll. 58-65] for displaying an executed GUI received from the received transmissions which the user can select from).

Knudson is silent on the subscriber terminal sending a service request to said session manager for processing.

Goode however teaches an information server and session manager that provides data streams in response to selection request (which reads on a signal) for information from an interactive network interface used to communicate the selection to the provider (see [fig. 1 items 102 & 104], [pp. 3, ll. 6-34], [pp. 5, ll. 12-13], [pp. 2-3, ll. 33-5], [pp. 6-7, ll. 24-1]).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a selection signaling mechanism such as a information request to indicate a request for information, allowing the user to receive data, as taught in Goode, when receiving user selections indicating preferred subscription on-demand services, as taught in Knudson, because some form of signaling mechanism is needed to convey the user's selection via a graphical user interface to a remote device.

Hamlin teaches the use of a dynamically delivered applet for the purpose of generating an interactive user interface to gathering information from a client display unit such as a television set rather than a locally-stored program that generates an interface (see [col. 6, ll. 39-51] for using an applet to gather data from a client device to be later processed).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the GUI used to collect information from viewers, as taught in Knudson, by using dynamically delivered applets, as taught by Hamlin, in order to enable future updates to be made to the function or appearance of the GUI without having to modify the client system.

Regarding claim 17: Knudson, in view of Goode and Alonso, teaches the apparatus of claim 16 wherein the subscriber terminal decodes and executes the applets that are sent by the session manager to produce said interactive graphical user interface displays (see Knudson [fig. 2], [figs. 7-9], [col. 3-4, ll. 63-3], [col. 4, ll. 32-37], [col. 4, ll. 42-47] for demodulating and displaying a GUI).

Knudson is silent on sending to the video session manager selection signals indicative of a selected option within said interactive graphical user interface displays.

Goode however teaches an information server that provides data streams in response to selection request (which reads on a signal) for information from an interactive network interface used to communicate the selection to the provider (see [fig. 1 items 102 & 104], [pp. 3, ll. 6-34], [pp. 5, ll. 12-13], [pp. 2-3, ll. 33-5], [pp. 6-7, ll. 24-1]).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a selection signaling mechanism such as a information request to indicate a request for information allowing the user to receive data, as taught in Goode, when providing subscription on-demand services, as taught in Knudson, because some form of signaling mechanism is required to convey the user's selection via a graphical user interface to a remote device.

Hamlin teaches the use of a dynamically delivered applet for the purpose of generating an interactive user interface to gathering information from a client

display unit such as a television set rather than a locally-stored program that generates an interface (see [col. 6, ll. 39-51] for using an applet to gather data from a client device to be later processed).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the GUI used to collect information from viewers, as taught in Knudson, by using dynamically delivered applets, as taught by Hamlin, in order to enable future updates to be made to the function or appearance of the GUI without having to modify the client system.

Regarding claim 18: Knudson teaches the apparatus of claim 16 wherein said video session manager, to provide security and system administration (see [col. 3, ll. 22-31] but is silent on accessing a personal identification database, a terminal identification database, and a subscriber database that are contained in a network manager.

Good teaches where a subscriber can be identified using a PIN, terminal identification number, or an account number (see [fig. 1 items 102 & 104], [pp. 2-3, ll. 33-5], [pp. 6-7, ll. 24-1], [col. 7, ll. 6-9]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to user other forms of identification such as PIN, terminal identification number or account number stored in a look-up-table, as taught in Goode, when providing authorization techniques for subscription on-demand services, as taught in Knudson, because providing a alternate forms of

identification provides more flexible and useful security measures (see [col. 1, ll. 52-56]).

Hamlin teaches the use of a dynamically delivered applet for the purpose of generating an interactive user interface to gathering information from a client display unit such as a television set rather than a locally-stored program that generates an interface (see [col. 6, ll. 39-51] for using an applet to gather data from a client device to be later processed).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the GUI used to collect information from viewers, as taught in Knudson, by using dynamically delivered applets, as taught by Hamlin, in order to enable future updates to be made to the function or appearance of the GUI without having to modify the client system.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Thomas whose telephone number is (571) 270-5080. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thurs., 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Koenig can be reached on (571) 272-7296. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

J. Thomas

/Andrew Y Koenig/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2423